

**PROJECT DEVELOPMENT BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
OCTOBER 14, 2005  
6:00 P.M.**

A Regular Meeting of the Project Development Board (PDB) for the Laurel County Judicial Center met on October 14, 2005 at Carnaby Square Shopping Center, Laurel County Fiscal Courtroom, London, Kentucky. Present and presiding Lawrence Kuhl, Laurel County Judge Executive.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Judge Kuhl called the Regular Meeting of the Project Development Board to order.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Laurel County Project Development Board Secretary, Sandy Wallace, took roll as follows:

Garlan Vanhook, Project Manager-Present  
Lawrence Kuhl, Judge/Executive-Chairman- Present  
Roy Crawford, Magistrate-Present  
Roderick Messer, Circuit Judge-Present  
Roger Schott, Circuit Clerk-Present  
Warren Scoville, Attorney-Present  
Doug Reece, Attorney-Absent

**Others Present:**

Vance Mitchell-AOC  
Billy Oakley-Magistrate

Mr. Vanhook introduced Vance Mitchell as Mr. Vanhook's most likely designee and/or proxy in the event that he wouldn't be able to attend a meeting that would require Mr. Vanhook in order to make a quorum or execute the business of this Board. Mr. Mitchell is one of his most excellent staff and I am proud to have him with me and I have a lot of faith in him.

Judge Kuhl also introduced Magistrate Billy Oakley to the Board.

**3. READING AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

A motion was made by Warren Scoville and second by Roger Schott to approve the minutes of the September 19, 2005 meeting as received and reviewed with an amendment to Page 5, Paragraph 3, last sentence. This sentence should read, "Even if we interview CM's we have no obligation to hire them". The vote was taken and carried as follows:

Yes carries unanimously.

#### **4. OLD OR UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

##### **A. Review and Discuss Architect Proposals Received**

Judge Kuhl stated that at the last meeting the Board authorized him to advertise for proposals (RFP) for the architect, financial agent and construction manager. Judge Kuhl continued that the Board had the proposals that they needed to review and it was discussed at the last meeting that we would only review the proposals from the architects. Judge Kuhl stated that the Board needed to decide whether we want to narrow it down to three (3) or no more than six (6) for interviews. Judge Kuhl asked that Garlan Vanhook give some insight as to what was done in other counties.

Mr. Vanhook stated that our regulatory process says that we have to interview at least three (3) architectural firms but we have to narrow it down to not more than six (6). We have received nine so the chore today would be to eliminate three (3) or more prior to the interview process. Mr. Vanhook continued that Washington County interview six (6) architects and I think by the end of the night that Judge Settles was calling other county judges saying that it took too long and redundant and that he would recommend that they consider something less than six. However, I wrote the regulation so that we could see as many bodies and get as many personalities involved as the Board would want to and yet, also set some sort of limit to keep us from feeling that we had to interview all the applicants when they may clearly not be qualified.

Judge Kuhl asked the Board their feeling on selecting a number from three (3) to six (6).

Judge Messer suggested that they should talk about it and see where we are on who we like and then; if we have a consensus we can use a smaller number but if we have some disagreement then maybe one or two more than you may want to ask to come in and do four (4) or five (5) instead of just three (3).

Garlan Vanhook stated that the Board may want to make a yes, no and a maybe pile.

Judge Kuhl stated that Doug Reece has reviewed the proposals and sent us his evaluation of the proposals.

Judge Kuhl stated that the Board had been provided with a list in alphabetical order and that they would be reviewed in that order.

Garlan Vanhook stated that because of the circumstances of this discussion that the Board should go into executive session.

### **(1) Executive Session**

A motion was made by Warren Scoville and seconded by Roy Crawford to go into executive session. The vote was taken and carried as follows:

Yes carries unanimously.

A motion was made by Warren Scoville and seconded by Roger Schott for the Board to come out of executive session. The vote was taken and carried as follows:

Yes carries unanimously.

A motion was made by Judge Messer and seconded by Roger Schott to interview three (3) architectural firms, CMW, Inc., DLZ Kentucky, Inc. and Sherman-Carter-Barnhart. The vote was taken and carried as follows:

Yes carries unanimously.

Judge Kuhl stated that we would send invitations to these three (3) companies for interviews and presentations to the entire board. The other firms that have sent proposals in, we will send them a letter expressing our appreciation for their having submitted proposals.

Judge Kuhl continued stating that we need to set a date and a time to do the interviews.

After discussion the date and time for interviewing the three (3) architectural firms was set for November 7, 2005 beginning at 6:00 p.m.

### **B. Review and Discuss Financial Agent Proposals Received**

A motion was made by Roger Schott and seconded by Roy Crawford that the Board accept the proposal of Ross Sinclair and Associates, the only Financial Agent Proposal received. The vote was taken and carried as follows:

Yes carries unanimously.

### **C. Review and Discuss Construction Manager Proposals Received**

A motion was made by Roger Schott and seconded by Judge Messer to table the review of the Construction Manager Proposals until a later date. The vote was taken and carried as follows:

Yes carries unanimously.

## 5. NEW BUSINESS

### A. Discuss Real Estate for Site Selection (Criteria)

Judge Kuhl stated that the Board had discussed some of the criteria for the site selection. Judge Kuhl asked if the Board wanted to advertise in a way that property owners come in and submit their proposals or if they wanted to advertise and get the proposal and review them first.

It was decided that the Board would prefer to get the proposals for review first.

Garlan Vanhook stated that this process is a little different than a public hearing. The selection of the architect is not a public hearing. We are required to have a public hearing on the land acquisition.

Judge Kuhl asked if they couldn't have it after the Board receives the proposals.

Mr. Vanhook stated that the public hearing, by our regulations, says that is for anyone to publicly step-up and say that they are involved. If somebody wanted to choose not to attend that public meeting or if someone were to choose to bring you a packet that says, on my behalf, I want you to read this at the public hearing, then I think that is okay.

Judge Kuhl stated that what we need to do is advertise and we will have them to come to our regularly scheduled meeting which is November 21, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. and that starts that process. We don't have to make the decision that night but we can have the public hearing that night.

Mr. Vanhook stated that the Board could possibly have the architect on board by that date and them in attendance if we were to choose.

A motion was made by Roger Schott and seconded by Judge Messer to advertise and conduct the public hearing for land acquisition at the regularly scheduled meeting of the Project Development Board on November 21, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. The vote was taken and carried as follows:

Yes carries unanimously.

Judge Kuhl asked how the Board would like for the advertisement to be structured.

A motion was made by Roy Crawford and seconded Judge Messer to discuss the structure of the advertisement for land acquisition in closed session. The vote was taken and carried as follows:

Yes carries unanimously.

A motion was made by Warren Scoville and seconded by Roy Crawford to come out of closed session. The vote was taken and carried as follows:

Yes carries unanimously.

A motion was made by Warren Scoville and seconded by Roy Crawford that the Board consider the property from 1<sup>st</sup> Street, by City Hall, West of Main Street down to 7<sup>th</sup> Street and three (3) blocks to the West of Main Street as the criteria to be placed in the advertisement to be considered for any proposal. The vote was taken and carried as follows:

Warren Scoville – Yes

Judge Messer – Yes

Roy Crawford – Yes

Lawrence Kuhl- Yes

Roger Schott – No

Yes carries the vote (Yes-4, No-1).

#### **6. OTHER BUSINESS**

None

#### **7. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Judge Kuhl stated that the next meeting will be on November 21, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.

#### **8. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Judge Messer and seconded by Warren Scoville that the meeting be adjourned. The vote was taken and carried as follows:

Yes carries unanimously.

---

Lawrence Kuhl, Chairman Project Development Board  
Laurel County Judge/Executive

---

Sandra C. Wallace, Secretary Project Development Board